

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,794	02/08/2001	Hiroshi Isono	108482	3978
25944	7590 01/21/2003			
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			EXAMINER	
			BURCH, MELODY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3683	
			DATE MAILED: 01/21/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
•5·	09/778,794	ISONO ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Melody M. Burch	3683			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe					
THE REPLY FILED 26 December 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearamentation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	CE THIS APPLICATION IN COI void abandonment of this applic) a timely filed amendment whi al (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	NDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of this Ad event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in han SIX MONTHS from the mailing date FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI ate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1 asion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set is	e of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee the fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth			
any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI	•				
2.⊠ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	pelow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: see number 5.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s): <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to: <u>19</u> .					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-12,14,16-18,20 and 21</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8.⊠ The proposed drawing correction filed on <u>19 June</u>	2002 is a) $□$ approved or b) $⊠$	disapproved by the Examiner.			
9. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·			
10. Other: Note the attached PTO-892					
S. Patent and Trademark Office					

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 009/778,794

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Upon entry of the amendments, the amendment overcomes the 112 rejection to claim 1 with regards to the phrase "fluid pressure" in line 3, the 112 rejection to claims 3 and 8 with regards to the phrase "if the pressure" in line 8, and the 112 rejection with regards to the phrase "the power" in claim 5. Finally the objection to the drawing regarding PMO has been withdrawn in light of Applicant's response.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the inclusion of the limitation of "the opening amount of the brake operation" in claim 3 and the change of the limitation of a "reservoir tank" to a --reservoir chamber-- being larger than the pressure chamber of the master cylinder in claim 8 raise new issues that require further consideration. Further consideration has been given to the objection regarding the details added to the master cylinder in figure 1 and to the inclusion of the detailed figure 1A and the corresponding added information to the specification. Examiner notes that the added details fail to illustrate the invention to the same extent as it is described in the specification, for example, paragraph [0047] provides support for three return springs 1.) the return spring for the power piston 2.) the return spring for the input member and 3.) the return spring for the master cylinder, however, only two springs are shown in revised figure 1 and new figure 1A. Examiner has included US Patent 4708404 to Seibert et al. with this Advisory Action to demonstrate that there is no standard internal structure for master cylinders. The master cylinder 1 of the Seibert et al. reference, for example, includes two pistons 2,3 and three springs 26,29,30 but is not drawn in the same fashion as Applicant's revised figure 1 and new figure 1A. Accordingly the new matter objection has been maintained.

mmB 1/14/03

> MATTHEW C. GRAHAM PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 310